

# Critical behavior in inhomogeneous random graphs

Remco van der Hofstad \*

July 16, 2010

## Abstract

We study the critical behavior of inhomogeneous random graphs where edges are present independently but with unequal edge occupation probabilities. The edge probabilities are moderated by *vertex weights*, and are such that the degree of vertex  $i$  is close in distribution to a Poisson random variable with parameter  $w_i$ , where  $w_i$  denotes the weight of vertex  $i$ . We choose the weights such that the weight of a uniformly chosen vertex converges in distribution to a limiting random variable  $W$ , in which case the proportion of vertices with degree  $k$  is close to the probability that a Poisson random variable with *random* parameter  $W$  takes the value  $k$ . We pay special attention to the *power-law case*, in which  $\mathbb{P}(W \geq k)$  is proportional to  $k^{-(\tau-1)}$  for some power-law exponent  $\tau > 3$ , a property which is then inherited by the asymptotic degree distribution.

We show that the critical behavior depends sensitively on the properties of the asymptotic degree distribution moderated by the asymptotic weight distribution  $W$ . Indeed, when  $\mathbb{P}(W \geq k) \leq ck^{-(\tau-1)}$  for all  $k \geq 1$  and some  $\tau > 4$  and  $c > 0$ , the largest critical connected component in a graph of size  $n$  is of order  $n^{2/3}$ , as on the Erdős-Rényi random graph. When, instead,  $\mathbb{P}(W \geq k) = ck^{-(\tau-1)}(1 + o(1))$  for  $k$  large and some  $\tau \in (3, 4)$  and  $c > 0$ , the largest critical connected component is of the much smaller order  $n^{(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)}$ .

## 1 Introduction and results

We study the critical behavior of inhomogeneous random graphs, where edges are present independently but with unequal edge occupation probabilities. Such inhomogeneous random graphs were studied in substantial detail in the seminal paper by Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [7], where various results have been proved, including their critical value by studying the connected component sizes in the super- and subcritical regimes.

In this paper, we study the *critical behavior* of such random graphs, and show that this critical behavior depends sensitively on the asymptotic properties of their degree sequence, i.e., the asymptotic proportion of vertices with degree  $k$  for each  $k \geq 1$ . Our results show that the critical behavior of our inhomogeneous random graphs admits a transition when the third moment of the degrees turns from finite to infinite.

---

\*Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Eindhoven University of Technology, P.O. Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands. [rhofstad@win.tue.nl](mailto:rhofstad@win.tue.nl)

## 1.1 Inhomogeneous random graphs: the rank-1 case

In this section, we introduce the random graph model that we shall investigate. In our models,  $\mathbf{w} = (w_j)_{j \in [n]}$  are vertex weights, and  $\ell_n$  is the total weight of all vertices given by  $\ell_n = \sum_{j=1}^n w_j$ . We shall mainly work with the Poisson random graph or *Norros-Reittu random graph* [32], which we denote by  $\text{NR}_n(\mathbf{w})$ . In the  $\text{NR}_n(\mathbf{w})$ , the edge probabilities are given by

$$p_{ij}^{(\text{NR})} = 1 - e^{-w_i w_j / \ell_n}. \quad (1.1)$$

More precisely,  $p_{ij}^{(\text{NR})}$  is the probability that edge  $ij$  is present or *occupied*, for  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ , and different edges are independent. In Section 1.3, we shall extend our results to graphs where the edge probabilities are either  $p_{ij} = \max\{w_i w_j / \ell_n, 1\}$  (as studied by Chung and Lu in [11, 12, 13, 14]) or  $p_{ij} = w_i w_j / (\ell_n + w_i w_j)$  (as studied by Britton, Deijfen and Martin-Löf in [10]). See [7, Section 16.4] for a detailed discussion of the relation between the general inhomogeneous random graph and the models studied here, which are called *rank-1 inhomogeneous random graphs* in [7].

Naturally, the graph structure depends sensitively on the empirical properties of the weights, which we shall now introduce. Let  $F$  be a distribution function, and define

$$w_j = [1 - F]^{-1}(j/n), \quad (1.2)$$

where  $[1 - F]^{-1}$  is the *generalized inverse* of  $1 - F$  defined, for  $u \in (0, 1)$ , by

$$[1 - F]^{-1}(u) = \inf\{s : [1 - F](s) \leq u\}. \quad (1.3)$$

By convention, we set  $[1 - F]^{-1}(1) = 0$ .

In the setting in (1.1) and (1.2), by [7, Theorem 3.13], the number of vertices with degree  $k$ , which we denote by  $N_k$ , satisfies, with  $W$  having distribution function  $F$  appearing in (1.2),

$$N_k/n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} f_k \equiv \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-W} \frac{W^k}{k!}\right], \quad k \geq 0, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}$  denotes convergence in probability. We recognize the limiting distribution  $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  as a so-called *mixed Poisson distribution with mixing distribution  $F$* , i.e., conditionally on  $W = w$ , the distribution is Poisson with mean  $w$ . Since a Poisson random variable with a large parameter is highly concentrated around that parameter, it is intuitively clear that the number of vertices with degree larger than  $k$  is, for large  $k$ , quite close to  $n[1 - F(k)]$ . In particular, for  $a > 0$ ,  $\sum_k k^a f_k < \infty$  precisely when  $\mathbb{E}[W^a] < \infty$ .

In our setting, there exists a giant component containing a positive proportion of the vertices precisely when  $\nu > 1$ , where we define

$$\nu = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W^2]}{\mathbb{E}[W]}. \quad (1.5)$$

As we explain in more detail in Section 1.3, we shall see that  $\nu$  arises as the mean of the *size-biased distribution* of  $W$ , which, in turn, arises as the mean offspring in a branching process approximation of the exploration of the connected component of a vertex. More precisely, if  $\nu > 1$ , then the largest connected component has  $n\zeta(1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1))$  vertices, while if  $\nu \leq 1$ , the largest connected component has  $o_{\mathbb{P}}(n)$  vertices. Here we write that  $X_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(b_n)$  for some sequence  $b_n$ , when  $X_n/b_n$  converges to zero in probability. See, e.g., [7, Theorem 3.1 and Section 16.4] and [11, 14, 32]. When  $\nu > 1$ , the rank-1 inhomogeneous random graph is called *supercritical*, when  $\nu = 1$  it is called *critical*, and when  $\nu < 1$ , it is called *subcritical*. The aim of this paper is to study the size of the largest connected components in the critical case.

## 1.2 Results

Before we can state our results, we introduce some notation. We write  $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$  for the set of vertices. For two vertices  $s, t \in [n]$ , we write  $s \longleftrightarrow t$  when there exists a path of occupied edges connecting  $s$  and  $t$ . By convention,  $v \longleftrightarrow v$ . For  $v \in [n]$ , we denote the *cluster of  $v$*  by  $\mathcal{C}(v) = \{x \in [n] : v \longleftrightarrow x\}$ . We denote the size of  $\mathcal{C}(v)$  by  $|\mathcal{C}(v)|$ , and define the *largest connected component* by  $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}| = \max\{|\mathcal{C}(v)| : v \in [n]\}$ . Our main results are:

**Theorem 1.1** (Largest critical cluster for  $\tau > 4$ ). *Fix  $\text{NR}_n(\mathbf{w})$  with  $\mathbf{w} = (w_j)_{j \in [n]}$  as in (1.2), and assume that the distribution function  $F$  in (1.2) satisfies  $\nu = 1$ . Suppose there exists a  $\tau > 4$  and a constant  $c_F > 0$  such that, for all large enough  $x \geq 0$ ,*

$$1 - F(x) \leq c_F x^{-(\tau-1)}. \quad (1.6)$$

Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = (\tilde{w}_j)_{j \in [n]}$  be defined by

$$\tilde{w}_j = (1 + \varepsilon_n)w_j, \quad (1.7)$$

and fix  $\varepsilon_n$  such that  $|\varepsilon_n| \leq \Lambda n^{-1/3}$  for some  $\Lambda > 0$ . Then there exists a constant  $b = b(\Lambda) > 0$  such that for all  $\omega > 1$  and for  $n$  sufficiently large,  $\text{NR}_n(\tilde{\mathbf{w}})$  satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\omega^{-1}n^{2/3} \leq |\mathcal{C}_{\max}| \leq \omega n^{2/3}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{b}{\omega}. \quad (1.8)$$

**Theorem 1.2** (Largest critical cluster for  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ ). *Fix  $\text{NR}_n(\mathbf{w})$  with  $\mathbf{w} = (w_j)_{j \in [n]}$  as in (1.2), and assume that the distribution function  $F$  in (1.2) satisfies  $\nu = 1$ . Suppose that there exists a  $\tau \in (3, 4)$  and a constant  $0 < c_F < \infty$  such that*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^{\tau-1}[1 - F(x)] = c_F. \quad (1.9)$$

Fix  $\varepsilon_n$  such that  $|\varepsilon_n| \leq \Lambda n^{-(\tau-3)/(\tau-1)}$  for some  $\Lambda > 0$ . Then there exists a constant  $b = b(\Lambda) > 0$  such that for all  $\omega > 1$  and for  $n$  sufficiently large,  $\text{NR}_n(\tilde{\mathbf{w}})$ , with  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$  defined as in (1.7), satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\omega^{-1}n^{(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)} \leq |\mathcal{C}_{\max}| \leq \omega n^{(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{b}{\omega}. \quad (1.10)$$

## 1.3 Discussion and related results

In this section, we discuss our results and the relevant results in the literature. We start by introducing some notation used throughout this paper. We write  $X \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda)$  to denote that  $X$  has a Poisson distribution with (possibly random) parameter  $\lambda$ , and  $a_n = \Theta(b_n)$  if there exist positive constants  $c$  and  $C$ , such that, for all  $n$ , we have  $cb_n \leq a_n \leq Cb_n$ .

**Branching process approximation.** The main tool used in this paper is the comparison of clusters to *branching processes*. Let  $V_n$  be a vertex chosen uniformly from  $[n]$ . Then, the number of neighbors of  $V_n$  is close to  $\text{Poi}(W_n)$ , where  $W_n = w_{V_n}$  is the (random) weight of  $V_n$ . In the setting of (1.2), we shall see that  $W_n$  converges in distribution to a random variable  $W$  having distribution function  $F$ , which explains that a uniformly chosen vertex has a degree that is close to  $\text{Poi}(W)$  (recall (1.4)). As described in more detail in Section 3.2, we can describe the set of vertices to which  $V_n$  is connected by associating a *random mark* to each of the  $\text{Poi}(W_n)$  values, where the mark equals  $i \in [n]$  with probability  $w_i/\ell_n$ . Then, the set of neighbors of  $V_n$  equals the set of

marks chosen. Further, the distribution of the *degree* of a neighbor of  $V_n$  is close to  $X \sim \text{Poi}(w_M)$ , where  $M$  is the mark associated to the neighbor, and the degrees of different neighbors of  $V_n$  are close to an i.i.d. sequence. Thus, the cluster exploration is close to a *branching process with offspring distribution*  $X \sim \text{Poi}(w_M)$ . It is not hard to see that  $\text{Poi}(w_M)$  converges in distribution to  $\text{Poi}(W^*)$ , where, for a non-negative random variable  $X$  with  $\mathbb{E}[X] > 0$ , we let  $X^*$  denote its *size-biased distribution* given by

$$\mathbb{P}(X^* \leq x) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[X \mathbb{1}_{\{X \leq x\}}]}{\mathbb{E}[X]}. \quad (1.11)$$

Thus,  $\text{Poi}(W^*)$  has finite variance when  $W$  has a finite third moment. For details, see Proposition 3.4, where this connection is made explicit. We denote the *mean offspring* of the branching process by

$$\nu_n = \mathbb{E}[\text{Poi}(w_M)] = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n w_j^2}{\sum_{j=1}^n w_j}. \quad (1.12)$$

In the setting of (1.2), we shall see that  $\nu_n \rightarrow \nu$ , where  $\nu$  is defined by (1.5) (see Corollary 3.2(b) below). Therefore, the resulting branching process is *critical* precisely when  $\nu = 1$ . Observe that the offspring  $\text{Poi}(W^*)$  of this branching process has *finite variance* when  $\tau > 4$ , but not when  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ . We now make use of the relation to branching processes to connect the subcritical and supercritical regimes to the critical one.

**Connecting the subcritical and supercritical regimes to the critical one.** We first give a heuristic explanation for the critical behavior of  $n^{2/3}$  appearing in Theorem 1.1. Let  $\varepsilon_n = \nu_n - 1$  and  $\tau > 4$ . By the branching process approximation, the largest connected component has size  $\rho_n n(1 + o(1))$  when  $\varepsilon_n > 0$ , where  $\rho_n$  is the survival probability of the branching process approximation to the cluster. Now,  $\rho_n$  is of the order  $\varepsilon_n$  when  $\tau > 4$ , since the corresponding branching process has finite variance in this case. On the other hand, the largest subcritical cluster is  $\Theta(\varepsilon_n^{-2} \log(n\varepsilon_n^3))$  when  $\varepsilon_n < 0$ , since, for branching processes with finite mean, the probability that the total progeny exceeds  $k$  is approximately equal to  $\Theta(1/\sqrt{k})e^{-\Theta(k\varepsilon_n^2)}$ . This suggests that the critical behavior arises precisely when  $\varepsilon_n^{-2} = n\varepsilon_n$ , i.e., when  $\varepsilon_n = n^{-1/3}$ , and in this case, the largest connected component is  $\varepsilon_n n = n^{2/3}$  as in Theorem 1.1.

We next extend this heuristic to the case  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ , for which the picture changes completely. The results by Janson in [22] suggest that the largest subcritical cluster is like  $w_1/(1 - \nu) = \Theta(n^{1/(\tau-1)}/|\varepsilon_n|)$  when  $\nu_n = 1 + \varepsilon_n$  and  $\varepsilon_n < 0$ . We note that [22] only proves this when  $\nu < 1$  is *fixed*, but we conjecture that it extends to all subcritical  $\nu$ . In the supercritical regime, instead, the largest connected component should be like  $n\rho_n$ , where  $\rho_n$  is the survival probability of the (infinite variance) branching process approximation of the cluster. A straightforward computation shows that, when  $\varepsilon_n > 0$  and  $\varepsilon_n = o(1)$ , we have  $\rho_n \sim \varepsilon_n^{1/(\tau-3)}$  (see Lemma 3.6 below). Thus, this suggests that the critical behavior should now be characterized instead by taking  $n^{1/(\tau-1)}/\varepsilon_n = \varepsilon_n^{1/(\tau-3)}n$ , which is  $\varepsilon_n = n^{-(\tau-3)/(\tau-1)}$ . In this case, the largest critical cluster should be of the order  $\varepsilon_n^{1/(\tau-3)}n \sim n^{(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)}$ , as in Theorem 1.2. This suggests that in both cases, the subcritical and supercritical regimes connect up nicely. In order to make these statements precise, and thus showing that Theorems 1.1–1.2 really deal with all the ‘critical weights’, we would need to show that when  $|\varepsilon_n|$  is much larger than  $n^{-1/3}$  and  $n^{-(\tau-3)/(\tau-1)}$ , respectively, the above heuristic bounds on  $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}|$ , for both the super- and subcritical regimes, are precise.

**The scaling limit of cluster sizes for  $\tau > 4$ .** A special case of Theorem 1.1 is the critical behavior for the Erdős-Rényi random graph (ERRG), where bounds as in (1.8) have a long history (see e.g., [16], as well as [5, 25, 30, 34] and the monographs [6, 27] for the most detailed results). The ERRG corresponds to taking  $w_j = c$  for all  $j \in [n]$ , and then  $\nu$  in (1.5) equals  $c$ . Therefore, criticality corresponds to  $w_j = 1$  for all  $j \in [n]$ . For the ERRG there is a tremendous amount of work on the question for which values of  $p$ , similar critical behavior is observed as for the critical value  $p = 1/n$  [1, 5, 16, 25, 29, 30]. Indeed, when we take  $p = (1 + \lambda n^{-1/3})/n$ , the largest cluster has size  $\Theta(n^{2/3})$  for every fixed  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , but it is  $o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{2/3})$  when  $\lambda \rightarrow -\infty$ , and has size  $\gg n^{2/3}$  when  $\lambda \gg 1$ . Therefore, the values  $p$  satisfying  $p = (1 + \lambda n^{-1/3})/n$  for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  are sometimes called the *critical window*.

Aldous [1] proves that the vector of ordered cluster sizes of the ERRG weakly converges to a limiting process, which can be characterized as the excursions of a standard Brownian motion with a parabolic drift, ordered in their sizes. A less well-known extension by Aldous [1] can be found in [1, Prop. 4], where an inhomogeneous random graph is studied in which there is an edge between  $i$  and  $j$  with probability  $1 - e^{-x_i x_j}$  for some vertex weights  $(x_i)_{i \in [n]}$  and different edges are independent. This corresponds to our setting when we take  $x_i = w_i / \sqrt{\ell_n}$ . Aldous shows in [1, Prop. 4] that the *ordered cluster weights* weakly converge to a limit closely related to that of the ERRG, where the weight of a set of vertices  $\mathcal{C}$  equals  $\sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}} x_c$ . Since the completion of the first version of this paper, in fact the weak convergence of the ordered cluster sizes has been proved independently and almost at the same time in [35, 4], using related means as in [1], and under the slightly weaker condition that  $\mathbb{E}[W^3] < \infty$ . We have included the proof of Theorem 1.1 as this proof follows the same lines as the proof of the novel result in Theorem 1.2, and the proof nicely elucidates the place where the restriction  $\tau > 4$  is used. It is not hard to see that our proofs in fact carry over to the situation where  $\mathbb{E}[W^3] < \infty$ , but we refrain from doing so for simplicity.

**The scaling limit of cluster sizes for  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ .** When  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ , large parts of the above discussion remain valid, however, the variance of  $\text{Poi}(W^*)$  arising in the exploration process is *infinite*. Therefore, the critical nature of the total progeny of the branching process approximation is rather different, which is reflected in different critical behavior. Since the completion of the first version of this paper, in fact the weak convergence of the ordered cluster sizes has been proved in [3]. The proof relies on the fact that the cluster exploration can be described by a *thinned Lévy process* having rather interesting behavior. In the proof in [3], the results derived in this paper, in particular Propositions 2.4 and 2.5 below, play a crucial role.

In our results, we have assumed the precise power-law form of  $1 - F$  in (1.9). A heuristic computation shows that when  $u \mapsto [1 - F]^{-1}(u) = u^{-1/(\tau-1)} \ell(u)$  for some function  $u \mapsto \ell(u)$  slowly varying at  $u = 0$ , then the size of  $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}|$  becomes  $n^{(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)} / \ell(1/n)$ , and the width of the critical window becomes  $n^{(\tau-3)/(\tau-1)} \ell(1/n)^2$ . This also sheds light on the *critical cases*  $\tau = 3$  and  $\tau = 4$ . Indeed, when  $\tau = 3$  and  $u \mapsto \ell(u)$  is such that  $\mathbb{E}[W^2] < \infty$ , we predict that the above applies. If  $\tau = 4$  and  $u \mapsto \ell(u)$  is such that  $\mathbb{E}[W^3] < \infty$ , then we predict that  $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}|$  is of order  $n^{2/3}$  as in Theorem 1.1, while if  $\tau = 4$  and  $u \mapsto \ell(u)$  is such that  $\mathbb{E}[W^3] = \infty$ , then we predict that  $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}|$  is of order  $n^{2/3} / \ell(1/n)$ , instead. The predictions for the critical window are accordingly. In our proofs, the presence of a slowly varying function should enter in Propositions 2.4–2.5 and Lemma 3.6 below.

**Asymptotic equivalence and contiguity.** We now define two random graph models that are closely related to the Norros-Reittu random graph. In the *generalized random graph model*



[10], which we denote by  $\text{GRG}_n(\mathbf{w})$ , the edge probability of the edge between vertices  $i$  and  $j$  is equal to  $p_{ij}^{(\text{GRG})} = \frac{w_i w_j}{\ell_n + w_i w_j}$ . In the *random graph with prescribed expected degree* or Chung-Lu random graph [11, 12, 13, 14], which we denote by  $\text{CL}_n(\mathbf{w})$ , the edge probabilities are given by  $p_{ij}^{(\text{CL})} = \max\{\frac{w_i w_j}{\ell_n}, 1\}$ . The Chung-Lu model is sometimes referred to as the random graph with given expected degrees, as the expected degree of vertex  $j$  is close to  $w_j$ .

By [24, Examples 3.5 and 3.6], in our setting, the graphs  $\text{NR}_n(\mathbf{w})$ ,  $\text{GRG}_n(\mathbf{w})$ , and  $\text{CL}_n(\mathbf{w})$  are *asymptotically equivalent* (meaning that all events have the same asymptotic probabilities), so that Theorems 1.1–1.2 apply to  $\text{GRG}_n(\mathbf{w})$  and  $\text{CL}_n(\mathbf{w})$  as well.

**The configuration model.** Given a **degree sequence**, namely, a sequence of  $n$  positive integers  $\mathbf{d} = (d_i)_{i \in [n]}$  with the total degree  $\ell_n^{(\text{CM})} = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i$  assumed to be even, the configuration model (CM) on  $n$  vertices with degree sequence  $\mathbf{d}$  is constructed as follows:

Start with  $n$  vertices and  $d_j$  half-edges adjacent to vertex  $j$ . Number the half-edges from 1 to  $\ell_n^{(\text{CM})}$  in some arbitrary order. At each step, two half-edges (not already paired) are chosen uniformly at random among all the unpaired half-edges and are paired to form a single edge in the graph. Remove the paired half-edges from the list of unpaired half-edges. Continue with this procedure until all half-edges are paired.

By varying the degree sequence  $\mathbf{d}$ , one obtains random graphs with various degree sequences in a similar way as how varying  $\mathbf{w}$  influences the degree sequence in the  $\text{NR}_n(\mathbf{w})$  model studied here. A first setting which produces a random graph with asymptotic degree sequences according to some distribution  $F$  arises by taking  $(d_i)_{i \in [n]} = (D_i)_{i \in [n]}$ , where  $(D_i)_{i \in [n]}$  are i.i.d. random variables with distribution function  $F$ . An alternative choice is to take  $(d_i)_{i \in [n]}$  such that the number of vertices with degree  $k$  equals  $\lceil nF(k) \rceil - \lceil nF(k-1) \rceil$ .

The graph generated in the construction of the CM is not necessarily *simple*, i.e., it can have self-loops and multiple edges. However, if

$$\nu_n^{(\text{CM})} = \frac{1}{\ell_n^{(\text{CM})}} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i(d_i - 1) \quad (1.13)$$

converges as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $d_j = o(\sqrt{n})$  for each  $j \in [n]$ , then the number of self-loops and multiple edges converge in distribution to independent Poisson random variables (see e.g., [23] and the references therein). In [31], the phase transition of the CM was investigated, and it was shown that when  $\nu_n^{(\text{CM})} \rightarrow \nu^{(\text{CM})} > 1$ , and certain conditions on the degrees are satisfied, then a giant component exists, while if  $\nu^{(\text{CM})} \leq 1$ , then the largest connected component has size  $o_{\mathbb{P}}(n)$ . In [26], some of the conditions were removed. Also the *barely supercritical* regime, where  $n^{1/3}(\nu_n - 1) \rightarrow \infty$ , is investigated. One of the conditions in [26] is that  $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{4+\eta} = O(n)$  for some  $\eta > 0$ , which, in the power-law setting, corresponds to  $\tau > 5$ . Here we write that  $f(n) = O(g(n))$  for a non-negative function  $g(n)$  when there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that  $|f(n)|/g(n) \leq C$  for all  $n \geq 1$ .

In [26, Remark 2.5], it is conjectured that this condition is not necessary, and that, in fact, the results should hold when  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i^3$  converges. Similar results are proved in [28] under related conditions. The results in [26, 28] suggest that the barely supercritical regime for the CM is similar to the one for the ERRG when  $\tau > 4$ . We strengthen this by conjecturing that Theorems 1.1-1.2 also hold for the CM when  $\varepsilon_n = \nu_n - 1$  is replaced by  $\varepsilon_n = \nu_n^{(\text{CM})} - 1$ . After the completion of the first version of this paper, a result in this direction was established in [18]. Indeed, denote

$$R = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} d_i^3. \quad (1.14)$$

Then, under the assumption that the maximal degree of the graph satisfies  $\Delta_n \equiv \max_{i \in [n]} d_i \leq n^{1/3} R^{1/3} / \log n$ , and for  $|\varepsilon_n| = |\nu_n^{(\text{CM})} - 1| \leq \Lambda n^{-1/3} R^{2/3}$ ,  $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}|$  is with high probability in between  $\omega n^{2/3} R^{-1/3}$  and  $n^{2/3} R^{-1/3} / \omega$  for large  $\omega > 1$ .

When  $\tau > 4$ ,  $R$  remains uniformly bounded, while for  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ ,  $R = \Theta(n^{1-3/(\tau-1)})$  and  $\Delta_n = \Theta(n^{1/(\tau-1)})$ . Therefore, for  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ , the bound on  $\Delta_n$  has an extra  $1/\log n$  too many to be able to compare it to our results. The high degree vertices play a crucial role in the scaling limit (as shown in [3]), so that we conjecture that the scaling limit is affected by this restriction. We also refer to the discussion in [18, Section 1.2] for a discussion on the relations between our results. It would be of interest to investigate the relations further.

It is well known that when (1.13) holds and  $\Delta_n = o(\sqrt{n})$ , the CM is asymptotically contiguous to a uniform random graph with the same degree sequence. Indeed, the number of self-loops and multiple edges converge in distribution to independent Poisson random variables, which are both equal to zero with positive probability. Further, the CM conditioned on not having any self-loops is a uniform random graph with the same degree sequence. Also the generalized random graph conditioned on its degrees is also a uniform random graph with that degree sequence (see e.g., [10]). Since the degrees of the barely supercritical regime in the rank-1 inhomogeneous random graph as studied here satisfy the conditions in [26], the results there also apply to our model, whenever  $\tau > 5$ . We leave further details of this argument to the reader.

## 2 Strategy of the proof

In this section, we describe the strategy of proof for Theorems 1.1–1.2. We start by discussing the relevant *first and second moment methods* in Section 2.1, and in Section 2.2, we reduce the proof to two key propositions.

### 2.1 First and second moment methods for cluster sizes

We denote by

$$Z_{\geq k} = \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{1}_{\{|\mathcal{C}(v)| \geq k\}} \quad (2.1)$$

the number of vertices that are contained in connected components of size at least  $k$ . Here, we write  $\mathbb{1}_A$  for the indicator of the event  $A$ .

The random variable  $Z_{\geq k}$  will be used to prove the asymptotics of  $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}|$ . This can be understood by noting that  $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}| \geq k$  occurs precisely when  $Z_{\geq k} \geq k$ , which allows us to prove bounds on  $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}|$  by investigating  $Z_{\geq k}$  for appropriately chosen values of  $k$ . This strategy has been successfully applied in several related settings, such as percolation on the torus in general dimension [9] as well as for percolation on high-dimensional tori [8, 19, 21]. This is the first time that this methodology is applied to an *inhomogeneous* setting.

The main aim of this section is to formulate the necessary bounds on cluster tails and expected cluster size that ensure the asymptotics in Theorems 1.1–1.2. This will be achieved in Propositions 2.1–2.3 below, which derive the necessary bounds for the upper and lower bounds on the maximal cluster size respectively. Throughout the paper, we will use the notation  $(x \wedge y) = \min\{x, y\}$ ,  $(x \vee y) = \max\{x, y\}$ .

**Proposition 2.1** (An upper bound on the largest critical cluster). *Fix  $\Lambda > 0$ , and suppose that there exist  $\delta > 1$  and  $a_1 = a_1(\Lambda) > 0$  such that, for all  $k \geq n^{\delta/(1+\delta)}$  and for  $V_n$  a uniformly chosen*

vertex in  $[n]$ , the bound

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k) \leq a_1(k^{-1/\delta} + (\varepsilon_n \vee n^{-(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)})^{1/(\delta-1)}) \quad (2.2)$$

holds, where

$$|\varepsilon_n| \leq \Lambda n^{-(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)}. \quad (2.3)$$

Then, there exists a  $b_1 = b_1(\Lambda) > 0$  such that, for all  $\omega \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}_{\max}| \geq \omega n^{\delta/(1+\delta)}) \leq \frac{b_1}{\omega}. \quad (2.4)$$

The bound in (2.2) can be understood as a bound on the tail of the total progeny of a branching process, where the first term corresponds to the total progeny being finite and larger than  $k$ , while the second term corresponds to the survival probability of the branching process. This will be made precise in the sequel.

*Proof.* We use the first moment method or Markov inequality, to bound

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}_{\max}| \geq k) = \mathbb{P}(Z_{\geq k} \geq k) \leq \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E}[Z_{\geq k}] = \frac{n}{k} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k), \quad (2.5)$$

where  $V_n \in [n]$  is a uniformly chosen vertex. Thus, we need to bound  $\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k)$  for an appropriately chosen  $k = k_n$ . We use (2.2), so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}_{\max}| \geq k) &\leq \frac{a_1 n}{k} \left( k^{-1/\delta} + (\varepsilon_n \vee n^{-(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)})^{1/(\delta-1)} \right) \\ &\leq a_1 \left( \omega^{-(1+1/\delta)} + (n^{1/(\delta+1)} |\varepsilon_n|^{1/(\delta-1)} \vee 1) \omega^{-1} \right) \\ &\leq a_1 \left( \omega^{-(1+1/\delta)} + (1 + \Lambda^{1/(\delta-1)}) \omega^{-1} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

when  $k = k_n = \omega n^{1/(1+1/\delta)} = \omega n^{\delta/(1+\delta)}$ , and where we have used (2.3). This completes the proof of Proposition 2.1, with  $b_1 = a_1(2 + \Lambda^{1/(\delta-1)})$ .  $\square$

Proposition 2.1 shows that to prove an upper bound on  $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}|$ , it suffices to prove an upper bound on the cluster tails of a uniformly chosen vertex. In order to prove a matching lower bound on  $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}|$ , we shall use the *second moment method*, for which we need to give a bound on the variance of  $Z_{\geq k}$ . To state the result, we define

$$\chi_{\geq k}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \mathbb{1}_{\{|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k\}}], \quad (2.7)$$

where  $\mathbf{p} = (p_{ij})_{1 \leq i < j \leq n}$  denote the edge probabilities of an inhomogeneous random graph, i.e., the edge  $ij$  is occupied with probability  $p_{ij}$  and the occupation status of different edges are independent. Then the main variance estimate on  $Z_{\geq k}$  is as follows:

**Proposition 2.2** (A variance estimate for  $Z_{\geq k}$ ). *For any inhomogeneous random graph with edge probabilities  $\mathbf{p} = (p_{ij})_{1 \leq i < j \leq n}$ , every  $n$  and  $k \in [n]$ ,  $\text{Var}(Z_{\geq k}) \leq n \chi_{\geq k}(\mathbf{p})$ .*

*Proof.* We use the fact that

$$\text{Var}(Z_{\geq k}) = \sum_{i,j \in [n]} [\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k, |\mathcal{C}(j)| \geq k) - \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k) \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(j)| \geq k)]. \quad (2.8)$$



We split the probability  $\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k, |\mathcal{C}(j)| \geq k)$ , depending on whether  $i \longleftrightarrow j$  or not, i.e., we split

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k, |\mathcal{C}(j)| \geq k) &= \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k, |\mathcal{C}(j)| \geq k, i \longleftrightarrow j) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k, |\mathcal{C}(j)| \geq k, i \nleftrightarrow j). \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

We can bound

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k, |\mathcal{C}(j)| \geq k, i \nleftrightarrow j) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\{|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k\} \circ \{|\mathcal{C}(j)| \geq k\}\right), \quad (2.10)$$

where, for two increasing events  $E$  and  $F$ , we write  $E \circ F$  to denote the event that  $E$  and  $F$  occur *disjointly*, i.e., that there exists a (random) set of edges  $K$  such that we can see that  $E$  occurs by only inspecting the edges in  $K$  and that  $F$  occurs by only inspecting the edges in  $K^c$ . Then, the BK-inequality [2, 17] states that

$$\mathbb{P}(E \circ F) \leq \mathbb{P}(E)\mathbb{P}(F). \quad (2.11)$$

Applying this to (2.10), we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k, |\mathcal{C}(j)| \geq k, i \nleftrightarrow j) \leq \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k)\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(j)| \geq k). \quad (2.12)$$

Therefore,

$$\text{Var}(Z_{\geq k}) \leq \sum_{i,j \in [n]} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k, |\mathcal{C}(j)| \geq k, i \longleftrightarrow j), \quad (2.13)$$

and we arrive at the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Z_{\geq k}) &\leq \sum_{i,j \in [n]} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k, |\mathcal{C}(j)| \geq k, i \longleftrightarrow j) \\ &= \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n]} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{j \in \mathcal{C}(i)\}}] = \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k\}} \sum_{j \in [n]} \mathbb{1}_{\{j \in \mathcal{C}(i)\}}\right] \\ &= \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}(i)| \mathbb{1}_{\{|\mathcal{C}(i)| \geq k\}}] = n\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \mathbb{1}_{\{|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k\}}] = n\chi_{\geq k}(\mathbf{p}). \quad \square \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

**Proposition 2.3** (A lower bound on the largest critical cluster). *Suppose that there exist  $\delta > 1$  and  $a_2 > 0$  such that for all  $k \leq n^{\delta/(1+\delta)}$  and for  $V_n$  a uniformly chosen vertex in  $[n]$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k) \geq \frac{a_2}{k^{1/\delta}}, \quad (2.15)$$

while

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}(V_n)|] \leq n^{(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)}, \quad (2.16)$$

then there exists an  $b_2 > 0$  such that, for all  $\omega \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}_{\max}| \leq \omega^{-1}n^{\delta/(1+\delta)}) \leq \frac{b_2}{\omega^{2/\delta}}. \quad (2.17)$$

*Proof.* We use the second moment method or Chebychev inequality, as well as the fact that  $|\mathcal{C}_{\max}| < k$  precisely when  $Z_{\geq k} = 0$ , to obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}_{\max}| < \omega^{-1}n^{\delta/(1+\delta)}) = \mathbb{P}(Z_{\geq \omega^{-1}n^{\delta/(1+\delta)}} = 0) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(Z_{\geq \omega^{-1}n^{\delta/(1+\delta)}})}{\mathbb{E}[Z_{\geq \omega^{-1}n^{\delta/(1+\delta)}}]^2}. \quad (2.18)$$

By (2.15), we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_{\geq \omega^{-1}n^{\delta/(1+\delta)}}] = n\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq \omega^{-1}n^{\delta/(1+\delta)}) \geq \frac{na_2\omega^{1/\delta}}{n^{1/(1+\delta)}} = a_2\omega^{1/\delta}n^{\delta/(\delta+1)}. \quad (2.19)$$

Also, by Proposition 2.2, with  $k = k_n = \omega^{-1}n^{\delta/(\delta+1)}$ ,

$$\text{Var}(Z_{\geq \omega^{-1}n^{\delta/(\delta+1)}}) \leq n\chi_{\geq \omega^{-1}n^{\delta/(\delta+1)}}(\mathbf{p}) \leq n^{1+(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)} = n^{2\delta/(\delta+1)}. \quad (2.20)$$

Substituting (2.18)–(2.20), we obtain, for  $n$  sufficiently large,

$$\mathbb{P}_1(|\mathcal{C}_{\max}| < \omega^{-1}n^{\delta/(1+\delta)}) \leq \frac{n^{2\delta/(\delta+1)}}{a_2^2\omega^{2/\delta}n^{2\delta/(\delta+1)}} = \frac{1}{a_2^2\omega^{2/\delta}}. \quad (2.21)$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 2.3.  $\square$

## 2.2 Reduction of the proof to two key propositions

In this section, we state two key proposition and use it to complete the proof of Theorems 1.1–1.2. We denote

$$\delta = (\tau \wedge 4) - 2. \quad (2.22)$$

Our main technical results are formulated in the following two propositions:

**Proposition 2.4** (An upper bound on the cluster tail). *Fix  $\text{NR}_n(\mathbf{w})$  with  $\mathbf{w} = (w_j)_{j \in [n]}$  as in (1.2), and assume that the distribution function  $F$  in (1.2) satisfies  $\nu = 1$ . Assume that (1.6) holds for some  $\tau > 4$ , or that (1.9) holds for some  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ , and fix  $\varepsilon_n$  such that  $|\varepsilon_n| \leq \Lambda n^{-(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)}$  for some  $\Lambda > 0$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$  be defined as in (1.7). Then, for all  $k \geq 1$  and for  $V_n$  a uniformly chosen vertex in  $[n]$ :*

(a) *There exists a constant  $a_1 > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k) \leq a_1(k^{-1/\delta} + (\varepsilon_n \vee n^{-(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)})^{1/(\delta-1)}). \quad (2.23)$$

(b) *There exists a constant  $a_2 > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k) \geq \frac{a_2}{k^{1/\delta}}. \quad (2.24)$$

**Proposition 2.5** (An upper bound on the expected cluster size). *Fix  $\Lambda \geq 1$  sufficiently large, and let  $\varepsilon_n \leq -\Lambda n^{-(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)}$ . Then, for  $V_n$  a uniformly chosen vertex in  $[n]$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}(V_n)|] \leq n^{(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)}. \quad (2.25)$$

Now we are ready to prove Theorems 1.1–1.2:

**Upper bounds in Theorems 1.1–1.2.** The upper bounds follow immediately from Propositions 2.1 and 2.4(a), when we recall the definition of  $\delta$  in (2.22), so that (2.3) is the same as  $|\varepsilon_n| \leq \Lambda n^{-1/3}$  for  $\tau > 4$ , as assumed in Theorem 1.1, and  $|\varepsilon_n| \leq \Lambda n^{-(\tau-3)/(\tau-2)}$  for  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ , as assumed in Theorem 1.2.

**Lower bounds in Theorems 1.1–1.2.** For the lower bounds, we note that there is an obvious monotonicity in the weights, so that the cluster for  $\tilde{w}_i$  as in (1.7) with  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n = -\Lambda n^{-(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)}$  is stochastically smaller than the one for  $\varepsilon_n$  with  $|\varepsilon_n| \leq \Lambda n^{-(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)}$ . Then, we make use of Proposition 2.3, and check that its assumptions are satisfied due to Propositions 2.4(b) and 2.5.  $\square$

### 3 Preliminaries

In this section, we derive preliminary results needed in the proofs of Propositions 2.4 and 2.5. We start in Section 3.1 by analyzing sums of functions of the vertex weights, and in Section 3.2 we describe a beautiful connection between branching processes and clusters in the Norros-Reittu model originating in [32].

#### 3.1 The weight $W_n$ of a uniformly chosen vertex

In this section, we investigate the weight of a uniformly chosen vertex in  $[n]$ , which we denote by  $W_n$ . For this, we first note that

$$[1 - F]^{-1}(1 - u) = F^{-1}(u) = \inf\{x : F(x) \geq u\}, \quad (3.1)$$

which, in particular, implies that  $W = [1 - F]^{-1}(U)$  has distribution function  $F$  when  $U$  is uniform on  $(0, 1)$ . Further,  $W_n$  is a random variable with distribution function  $F_n$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} F_n(x) &= \mathbb{P}(W_n \leq x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{w_j \leq x\}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{[1-F]^{-1}(\frac{j}{n}) \leq x\}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{[1-F]^{-1}(1 - \frac{i}{n}) \leq x\}} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{F^{-1}(\frac{i}{n}) \leq x\}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\frac{i}{n} \leq F(x)\}} = \frac{1}{n} (\lfloor nF(x) \rfloor + 1) \wedge 1, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where we write  $j = n - i$  in the fourth equality and use (3.1) in the fifth equality. Note that  $F_n(x) \geq F(x)$ , which shows that  $W_n$  is stochastically dominated by  $W$ , so that, in particular, for *increasing* functions  $x \mapsto h(x)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n h(w_j) \leq \mathbb{E}[h(W)]. \quad (3.3)$$

In the sequel, we shall repeatedly bound expectations of functions of  $W_n$  using the following lemma:

**Lemma 3.1** (Expectations of  $W_n$ ). *Let  $W$  have distribution function  $F$  and let  $W_n$  have distribution function  $F_n$  in (3.2). Let  $h: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a differentiable function with  $h(0) = 0$  such that  $|h'(x)|[1 - F(x)]$  is integrable on  $[0, \infty)$ . Then,*

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(W)]| \leq \int_{w_1}^{\infty} |h'(x)|[1 - F(x)]dx + \frac{1}{n} \int_0^{w_1} |h'(x)|dx. \quad (3.4)$$

*Proof.* We write, using the fact that  $h(0) = 0$  and that  $|h'(x)|[1 - F(x)]$  is integrable, for any  $B > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[h(W) \mathbb{1}_{\{W \leq B\}}] \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^{\infty} h'(x) \mathbb{1}_{\{x < W \leq B\}} dx \right] = \int_0^B h'(x) [F(B) - F(x)] dx. \quad (3.5)$$

Because of this representation, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(W)] = \int_0^\infty h'(x)[F(x) - F_n(x)]dx. \quad (3.6)$$

Now,  $F_n(w_1) = 1$  by construction (recall (3.2)), so that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(W)] \right| \leq \int_{w_1}^\infty |h'(x)|[1 - F(x)]dx + \int_0^{w_1} |h'(x)|[F_n(x) - F(x)]dx. \quad (3.7)$$

We finally use the fact that  $0 \leq F_n(x) - F(x) \leq 1/n$  to arrive at the claim.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.2** (Bounds on characteristic function and mean degrees). *Let  $W$  and  $W_n$  have distribution functions  $F$  and  $F_n$ , respectively, and assume that (1.6) holds for some  $\tau > 3$ .*

(a) *Let*

$$\phi_n(t) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_n e^{(1+\varepsilon_n)W_n(e^{it}-1)}]}{\mathbb{E}[W_n]}, \quad \phi(t) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W e^{W(e^{it}-1)}]}{\mathbb{E}[W]}. \quad (3.8)$$

Then,

$$|\phi_n(t) - \phi(t)| \leq cn^{-(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)} + c|t|(n^{-(\tau-3)/(\tau-1)} + |\varepsilon_n|). \quad (3.9)$$

(b) *With  $\nu$  as in (1.5),  $\nu_n$  as in (1.12) and with  $\tilde{\nu}_n = (1 + \varepsilon_n)\nu_n$ ,*

$$|\tilde{\nu}_n - \nu| \leq c(|\varepsilon_n| + n^{-(\tau-3)/(\tau-1)}). \quad (3.10)$$

We remark that if (1.6) holds for some  $\tau > 4$  or (1.9) holds for some  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ , then also (1.6) holds for that  $\tau > 3$ . This explains the assumption that  $\tau > 3$  in Corollary 3.2.

*Proof.* (a) We first take  $\varepsilon_n = 0$ , and split

$$\phi_n(t) - \phi(t) = \frac{\phi(t)}{\mathbb{E}[W]} \left( \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[W_n]} - \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[W]} \right) + \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[W_n]} \left( \mathbb{E}[W_n e^{W_n(e^{it}-1)}] - \mathbb{E}[W e^{W(e^{it}-1)}] \right). \quad (3.11)$$

Lemma 3.1 applied to  $h(x) = x$  yields  $|\mathbb{E}[W_n] - \mathbb{E}[W]| \leq cn^{-(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)}$ . To apply Lemma 3.1 to  $h(x) = xe^{x(e^{it}-1)}$ , we compute

$$|h'(x)| = |e^{x(e^{it}-1)} + i(e^{it} - 1)xe^{it(x-1)}| \leq 1 + x|t|. \quad (3.12)$$

Therefore, also using the fact that  $w_1 = \Theta(n^{1/(\tau-1)})$  by (1.6),

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}[W_n e^{W_n(e^{it}-1)}] - \mathbb{E}[W e^{W(e^{it}-1)}] \right| &\leq \int_{w_1}^\infty (1 + x|t|)[1 - F(x)]dx + \frac{1}{n} \int_0^{w_1} (1 + x|t|)dx \\ &\leq cn^{-(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)} + c|t|n^{-(\tau-3)/(\tau-1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Together, these two estimates prove the claim for  $\varepsilon_n = 0$ . For  $\varepsilon_n \neq 0$ , we use the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_n e^{(1+\varepsilon_n)W_n(e^{it}-1)}]}{\mathbb{E}[W_n]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_n e^{W_n(e^{it}-1)}]}{\mathbb{E}[W_n]} &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_n e^{W_n(e^{it}-1)}(e^{\varepsilon_n W_n(e^{it}-1)} - 1)]}{\mathbb{E}[W_n]} \\ &= O(|\varepsilon_n||t|\mathbb{E}[W_n^2]/\mathbb{E}[W_n]) = O(|\varepsilon_n||t|). \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

(b) The proof of (3.10) is similar.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3** (Bounds on moments of  $W_n$ ). *Let  $W_n$  have distribution function  $F_n$  in (3.2).*

(i) *Assume that (1.6) holds for some  $\tau > 3$ , and let  $a < \tau - 1$ . Then, for  $x$  sufficiently large, there exists a  $C = C(a, \tau)$  such that, uniformly in  $n$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n^a \mathbb{1}_{\{W_n \geq x\}}] \leq Cx^{a+1-\tau}. \quad (3.15)$$

(ii) *Assume that (1.9) holds for some  $\tau > 3$ , and let  $a > \tau - 1$ . Then, there exist  $C_1 = C_1(a, \tau)$  and  $C_2 = C_2(a, \tau)$  such that, uniformly in  $n$ ,*

$$C_1(x \wedge n^{1/(\tau-1)})^{a+1-\tau} \leq \mathbb{E}[W_n^a \mathbb{1}_{\{W_n \leq x\}}] \leq C_2x^{a+1-\tau}. \quad (3.16)$$

*Proof.* (i) When  $a < \tau - 1$ , the expectation is finite. We rewrite, using (3.5),

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n^a \mathbb{1}_{\{W_n \geq x\}}] = x^a[1 - F_n](x) + a \int_x^\infty v^{a-1}[1 - F_n(v)]dv. \quad (3.17)$$

Now,  $1 - F_n(x) \leq 1 - F(x)$ , so that we may replace the  $F_n$  by  $F$  in an upper bound. When (1.6) holds for some  $\tau > 3$ , we can further bound this as

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n^a \mathbb{1}_{\{W_n \geq x\}}] \leq c_F x^{a+1-\tau} + c_F a \int_x^\infty w^{a-\tau} dw = O(x^{a+1-\tau}). \quad (3.18)$$

(ii) We again use (3.5) and the bound in (1.9) to rewrite

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n^a \mathbb{1}_{\{W_n \leq x\}}] = a \int_0^x v^{a-1}[F_n(x) - F_n(v)]dv \leq a \int_0^x v^{a-1}[1 - F(v)]dv \leq c_F a \int_0^x v^{a-\tau} dv = O(x^{a+1-\tau}).$$

For the lower bound, we first assume that  $x \leq n^{1/(\tau-1)}$  and use the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[W_n^a \mathbb{1}_{\{W_n \leq x\}}] &= a \int_0^x v^{a-1}[F_n(x) - F_n(v)]dv \geq a \int_0^{\varepsilon x} v^{a-1}[F_n(x) - F_n(v)]dv \\ &= a \int_0^{\varepsilon x} v^{a-1}[1 - F_n(v)]dv - a^{-1}[1 - F_n(x)] \int_0^{\varepsilon x} v^{a-1}dv \\ &\geq a \int_0^{\varepsilon x} v^{a-1}[1 - F(v)]dv - \frac{a}{n} \int_0^{\varepsilon x} v^{a-1}dv - a[1 - F(x)] \int_0^{\varepsilon x} v^{a-1}dv \\ &\geq C(\varepsilon x)^{a+1-\tau} - C(\varepsilon x)^a/n - Cx^{-(\tau-1)}(\varepsilon x)^a \\ &= C\varepsilon^{a+1-\tau}x^{a+1-\tau} \left(1 - \varepsilon^{\tau-1}(x/n^{1/(\tau-1)})^{\tau-1} - \varepsilon^{\tau-1}\right) \geq C_2x^{a+1-\tau}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

when we take  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  sufficiently small, and we use the fact that  $x \leq n^{1/(\tau-1)}$ . When  $x \geq n^{1/(\tau-1)}$ , we can use the fact that  $w_1 = \Theta(n^{1/(\tau-1)})$ , so that

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n^a \mathbb{1}_{\{W_n \leq x\}}] \geq w_1^a/n \geq (cn^{1/(\tau-1)})^a/n = C_2(n^{1/(\tau-1)})^{a+1-\tau}. \quad (3.20)$$

□

### 3.2 Connection to mixed Poisson branching processes

In this section, we discuss the relation between our Poisson random graph and mixed Poisson branching processes due to Norros and Reittu [32].

**Stochastic domination of clusters by a branching process.** We shall dominate the cluster of a vertex in the Norros-Reittu model by the total progeny of an appropriate branching process. In order to describe this relation, we consider the cluster exploration of a uniformly chosen vertex  $V_n \in [n]$ . For this, we define the *mark distribution* to be the random variable  $M$  with distribution

$$\mathbb{P}(M = m) = w_m / \ell_n, \quad m \in [n]. \quad (3.21)$$

We define  $S_0 = 1$ , and, recursively, for  $i \geq 1$ ,

$$S_i = S_{i-1} + X_i - 1, \quad (3.22)$$

where  $(X_i)_{i \geq 1}$  is a sequence of independent random variables, where  $X_i$  has a mixed Poisson distribution with random parameter  $w_{M_i}$ , and where  $M_1$  is uniformly chosen in  $[n]$ , while  $(M_i)_{i \geq 2}$  are i.i.d. random marks with distribution (3.21). Let

$$T^{(2)} = \inf\{t \geq 1 : S_t = 0\} \quad (3.23)$$

denote the first hitting time of 0 of  $(S_i)_{i \geq 0}$ . By exploring a branching process tree, we see that  $T^{(2)}$  has the same distribution as the total progeny of a so-called *two-stage mixed Poisson branching process*, in which the root has  $X_1 \sim \text{Poi}(w_{V_n})$  children where  $V_n$  is chosen uniformly in  $[n]$ , and all other individuals have offspring distribution given by  $\text{Poi}(w_M)$ . In the sequel, we shall use the notation  $T^{(2)}$  for the total progeny of a two-stage mixed Poisson branching process with offspring distribution  $X_i \sim \text{Poi}(w_{M_i})$  and the root has offspring distribution  $X_1 \sim \text{Poi}(w_{V_n})$ . We shall use the notation  $T$  for the total progeny of a mixed Poisson branching process where every individual, including the root, has an i.i.d. offspring distribution  $X_i \sim \text{Poi}(w_{M_i})$ , where  $(M_i)_{i \geq 1}$  is an i.i.d. sequence of marks with distribution described in (3.21).

Clearly,  $w_{V_n}$  has distribution  $W_n$  defined in (3.2), while

$$\mathbb{P}(w_M \leq x) = \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{w_m \leq x\}} \mathbb{P}(M = m) = \frac{1}{\ell_n} \sum_{m=1}^n w_m \mathbb{1}_{\{w_m \leq x\}} = \mathbb{P}(W_n^* \leq x), \quad (3.24)$$

where  $W_n^*$  is the *size-biased distribution* of  $W_n$  (recall (1.11)). In order to define the cluster exploration in  $\text{NR}_n(\mathbf{w})$ , we define  $\tilde{X}_1 = X_1$  and, for  $i \geq 2$ ,

$$\tilde{X}_i = X_i \mathbb{1}_{\{M_i \notin \{M_1, \dots, M_{i-1}\}\}}, \quad (3.25)$$

and define  $\tilde{S}_i$  and  $\tilde{T}$  as in (3.22) and (3.23), where  $X_i$  is replaced by  $\tilde{X}_i$ . The definition in (3.25) can be thought of as a *thinning* of the branching process. The mark  $M_i$  corresponds to the *vertex label* corresponding to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  individual encountered in the exploration process. If we have already explored this vertex, then we should ignore it and all of its subsequent offspring, while if it is a new vertex, then we should keep it and explore its offspring. Thus, the definition in (3.25) can be thought of ensuring that we only explore the offspring of a vertex once. We think of  $\tilde{X}_i$  as the *potential* new vertices of the cluster  $\mathcal{C}(V_n)$  neighboring the  $i^{\text{th}}$  explored vertex. A potential vertex turns into a real new element of  $\mathcal{C}(V_n)$  when its mark or vertex label is one that we have not yet seen.

We will now make the connection between the thinned marked mixed Poisson branching process and the cluster exploration precise; this relation (in a slightly different context) was first proved in [32, Proposition 3.1]. Since the proof of [32, Proposition 3.1] is in terms of the number of vertices at distance  $k$  of the root, we reprove this result here in the setting of the cluster exploration:



**Proposition 3.4** (Clusters as thinned marked branching processes). *The cluster  $\mathcal{C}(V_n)$  of a uniformly chosen vertex in  $[n]$  is equal in distribution to  $\{M_1, \dots, M_{\tilde{T}}\}$ , i.e., the marks encountered in the thinned marked mixed Poisson branching process up to the end of the exploration  $\tilde{T}$ .*

*Proof.* We start by proving that the direct neighbors of the root agree in both constructions. We note that  $\tilde{X}_1 = X_1$ , which has a mixed Poisson distribution with mixing distribution  $w_{V_n}$ , which has the same distribution as  $W_n$ .

Conditionally on  $V_n = l$ ,  $X_1$  has a  $\text{Poi}(w_l)$  distribution. These  $\text{Poi}(w_l)$  offspring receive i.i.d. marks. As a result, the random vector  $(\tilde{X}_{1,j})_{j \in [n]}$ , where  $\tilde{X}_{1,j}$  is the number of offspring of the root that receive mark  $j$ , is a vector of *independent* Poisson random variables with parameters  $w_l w_k / \ell_n$ . Due to the thinning, a mark occurs precisely when  $\tilde{X}_{1,j} \geq 1$ , and these events are independent. Therefore, the mark  $j$  occurs, independently for all  $j \in [n]$ , with probability  $1 - e^{-w_j w_k / \ell_n} = p_{jk}^{(\text{NR})}$ , which proves that the set of neighbors of the root is equal in distribution to the marks found in our branching process.

Next, we look at the number of new vertices of  $\mathcal{C}(V_n)$  neighboring the  $i^{\text{th}}$  explored potential vertex. First, conditionally on  $M_i = l$ , and assume that  $l \notin \{M_1, \dots, M_{i-1}\}$ , so that  $\tilde{X}_i = X_i$ . Conditionally on  $M_i = j$  such that  $j \notin \{M_1, \dots, M_{i-1}\}$ ,  $\tilde{X}_i$  has a  $\text{Poi}(w_j)$  distribution. Each of these  $\text{Poi}(w_j)$  potential new vertices in  $\mathcal{C}(V_n)$  receives an i.i.d. mark. Let  $\tilde{X}_{i,j}$  denote the number of potential new vertices of  $\mathcal{C}(V_n)$  that receive mark  $j$ . Then,  $(\tilde{X}_{i,j})_{j \in [n]}$  again is a vector of *independent* Poisson random variables with parameters  $w_l w_k / \ell_n$ . Due to the thinning, a mark occurs precisely when  $\tilde{X}_{i,j} \geq 1$ , and these events are independent. In particular, for each  $j \notin \{M_1, \dots, M_i\}$ , the probability that the mark  $j$  occurs equals  $1 - e^{-w_j w_k / \ell_n} = p_{jk}^{(\text{NR})}$ , as required.  $\square$

Proposition 3.4 implies that, for all  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{T} \geq k) \leq \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq k). \quad (3.26)$$

Interestingly, when the weights equal  $w_i = n \log(1 - \lambda/n)$  for each  $i \in [n]$ , for which the graph is an Erdős-Rényi random graph with edge probability  $\lambda/n$ , the above implies that  $|\mathcal{C}(V_n)|$  is stochastically dominated by the total progeny of a Poisson branching process with parameter  $n \log(1 - \lambda/n)$ . Often, the stochastic domination is by a branching process with binomial  $n - 1$  and  $p = \lambda/n$  offspring distribution instead.

**Otter-Dwass formula for the branching process total progeny.** Our proofs make crucial use of the *Otter-Dwass formula*, which describes the distribution of the total progeny of a branching process (see [15] for the special case when the branching process starts with a single individual and [33] for the more general case, and [20] for a simple proof based on induction).

**Lemma 3.5** (Otter-Dwass formula). *Let  $(X_i)_{i \geq 1}$  be i.i.d. random variables. Let  $\mathbb{P}_m$  denote the Galton-Watson process measure with offspring distribution  $X_1$  started from  $m$  initial individuals, and denote its total progeny by  $T$ . Then, for all  $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}_m(T = k) = \frac{m}{k} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k X_i = k - m\right). \quad (3.27)$$

**The survival probability of near-critical mixed Poisson branching processes.** We shall also need bounds on the survival probability of near-critical mixed Poisson branching processes.

**Lemma 3.6** (Survival probability of near-critical mixed Poisson branching processes.). *Let  $\rho_n$  be the survival probability of a branching process with a  $\text{Poi}(W_n^*)$  offspring distribution. Assume that  $\varepsilon_n = \mathbb{E}[W_n^*] - 1 = \nu_n - 1 \geq 0$  and  $\varepsilon_n = o(1)$ . When (1.6) holds for some  $\tau > 4$ , there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that*

$$\rho_n \leq c\varepsilon_n. \quad (3.28)$$

When (1.9) holds for some  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ ,

$$\rho_n \leq c(\varepsilon_n^{1/(\tau-3)} \vee n^{-1/(\tau-1)}). \quad (3.29)$$

*Proof.* By conditioning on the first generation, the survival probability  $\rho$  of a branching process with offspring distribution  $X$  satisfies

$$1 - \rho = \mathbb{E}[(1 - \rho)^X]. \quad (3.30)$$

In our case,  $X \sim \text{Poi}(W_n^*)$ , for which  $\mathbb{E}[s^{\text{Poi}(W_n^*)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{W_n^*(s-1)}]$ , so that

$$1 - \rho_n = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\rho_n W_n^*}]. \quad (3.31)$$

We use the fact that  $e^{-x} \geq 1 - x$  when  $x \geq 1/2$  and  $e^{-x} \geq 1 - x + x^2/4$  when  $x \leq 1/2$ , to arrive at

$$1 - \rho_n \geq 1 - \rho_n \mathbb{E}[W_n^*] + \frac{\rho_n^2}{4} \mathbb{E}[(W_n^*)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_n W_n^* \leq 1/2\}}]. \quad (3.32)$$

Rearranging terms, dividing by  $\rho_n$  and using that  $\mathbb{E}[W_n^*] = \nu_n$ , we obtain

$$\rho_n \mathbb{E}[(W_n^*)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_n W_n^* \leq 1/2\}}] \leq 4(\nu_n - 1) = 4\varepsilon_n. \quad (3.33)$$

When (1.6) holds for some  $\tau > 4$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[(W_n^*)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_n W_n^* \leq 1/2\}}] = \mathbb{E}[(W^*)^2](1 + o(1)) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W^3]}{\mathbb{E}[W]}(1 + o(1)), \quad (3.34)$$

so that  $\rho_n \leq c\varepsilon_n$  for some constant  $c > 0$ . When, on the other hand, (1.9) holds for some  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ , then when  $\rho_n \leq 2n^{-1/(\tau-1)}$  the claimed bound holds. When, instead,  $\rho_n \geq 2n^{-1/(\tau-1)}$ , we may apply Lemma 3.3(ii) to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[(W_n^*)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_n W_n^* \leq 1/2\}}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_n^3 \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_n W_n \leq 1/2\}}]}{\mathbb{E}[W_n]} \geq c\rho_n^{\tau-4}, \quad (3.35)$$

so that  $c\rho_n^{\tau-3} \leq 4\varepsilon_n$ . Combining these two bounds proves (3.29).  $\square$

## 4 An upper bound on the cluster tail

In this section, we shall prove the upper bound on the tail probabilities of critical clusters in Proposition 2.4(a).

**Dominating the two-stage branching process by an ordinary branching process.** We rely on (3.26). Unfortunately, the Otter-Dwass formula (Lemma 3.5) is not directly valid for  $T^{(2)}$ , and we first establish that, for every  $k \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq k) \leq \mathbb{P}(T \geq k). \quad (4.1)$$

The bound in (4.1) is equivalent to the fact that  $T^{(2)} \preceq T$ , where  $X \preceq Y$  means that  $X$  is stochastically smaller than  $Y$ . Since the distributions of  $T^{(2)}$  and  $T$  agree except for the offspring of the root, where  $T^{(2)}$  has offspring distribution  $\text{Poi}(W_n)$ , whereas  $T$  has offspring distribution  $\text{Poi}(W_n^*)$ , this follows when  $\text{Poi}(W_n) \preceq \text{Poi}(W_n^*)$ . For two mixed Poisson random variables  $X, Y$  with mixing random variables  $W_X$  and  $W_Y$ , respectively,  $X \preceq Y$  follows when  $W_X \preceq W_Y$ . The proof of (4.1) is completed by noting that, for any non-negative random variable  $W$ , and for  $W^*$  its size-biased version, we have  $W \preceq W^*$ .

**The total progeny of our mixed Poisson branching process.** By (3.26) and (4.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k) &\leq \mathbb{P}(T \geq k) = \mathbb{P}(T = \infty) + \mathbb{P}(k \leq T < \infty) = \mathbb{P}(T = \infty) + \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(T = l) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(T = \infty) + \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^l X_i = l - 1\right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where the last formula follows from Lemma 3.5 for  $m = 1$ , and where  $(X_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is an i.i.d. sequence with a  $\text{Poi}(W_n^*)$  distribution. In the following proposition, we shall investigate  $\mathbb{P}(\sum_{i=1}^l X_i = l - 1)$ :

**Proposition 4.1** (Upper bound on probability mass function of  $\sum_{i=1}^l X_i$ ). *Let  $(X_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$  be an i.i.d. sequence with a mixed Poisson distribution with mixing random variable  $\tilde{W}_n^* = (1 + \varepsilon_n)W_n^*$ , where  $W_n^*$  is defined in (3.24). Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.4(a), there exists an  $\tilde{a}_1 > 0$  such that for all  $l \geq n^{\delta/(1+\delta)}$  and for  $n$  sufficiently large,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^l X_i = l - 1\right) \leq \tilde{a}_1 \left( l^{-1/\delta} + \left( n^{(\tau-4)/2(\tau-1)} \wedge 1 \right) l^{-1/2} \right), \quad (4.3)$$

where  $\delta > 0$  is defined in (2.22).

*Proof.* We rewrite, using the Fourier inversion theorem, and recalling  $\phi_n(t)$  in (3.8), which we can identify as  $\phi_n(t) = \mathbb{E}[e^{itX_1}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{(e^{it}-1)\tilde{W}_n^*}]$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^l X_i = l - 1\right) = \int_{[-\pi, \pi]} e^{-i(l-1)t} \phi_n(t)^l \frac{dt}{2\pi}, \quad (4.4)$$

so that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^l X_i = l - 1\right) \leq \int_{[-\pi, \pi]} |\phi_n(t)|^l \frac{dt}{2\pi}. \quad (4.5)$$

By dominated convergence and the weak convergence of  $\tilde{W}_n^*$  to  $W^*$ , for every  $t \in [-\pi, \pi]$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_n(t) = \phi(t) = \mathbb{E}[e^{W^*(e^{it}-1)}]. \quad (4.6)$$

Since, further,

$$|\phi'_n(t)| = |\mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_n^* e^{it} e^{(e^{it}-1)\tilde{W}_n^*}]| \leq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_n^*] = (1 + \varepsilon_n)\nu_n = 1 + o(1), \quad (4.7)$$

which is uniformly bounded, the convergence in (4.6) is uniform for all  $t \in [-\pi, \pi]$ . Further, for every  $\eta > 0$ , there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $|\phi(t)| < 1 - 2\varepsilon$  for all  $|t| > \eta$ , since our mixed Poisson random variable is not degenerate at 0. Therefore, uniformly for sufficiently large  $n$ , for every  $\eta > 0$ , there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $|\phi_n(t)| < 1 - \varepsilon$  for all  $|t| > \eta$ . Thus,

$$\int_{[-\pi, \pi]} |\phi_n(t)|^l \frac{dt}{2\pi} \leq (1 - \varepsilon)^l + \int_{[-\eta, \eta]} |\phi_n(t)|^l \frac{dt}{2\pi}. \quad (4.8)$$

We start by deriving the bound when  $\tau > 4$ , by bounding

$$|\phi_n(t)| \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-\tilde{W}_n^*[1-\cos(t)]}]. \quad (4.9)$$

Now using the fact that, uniformly for  $t \in [-\pi, \pi]$ , there exists an  $a > 0$  such that

$$1 - \cos(t) \geq at^2, \quad (4.10)$$

and, for  $x \leq 1$ , the bound  $e^{-x} \leq 1 - x/2$ , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_n(t)| &\leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-a\tilde{W}_n^*t^2}] \leq \mathbb{E}[(1 - a\tilde{W}_n^*t^2/2)\mathbb{1}_{\{a\tilde{W}_n^*t^2 \leq 1\}}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{a\tilde{W}_n^*t^2 > 1\}}] \\ &= 1 - at^2\mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_n^*] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{a\tilde{W}_n^*t^2 > 1\}}(1 + a\tilde{W}_n^*t^2/2)]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Further bounding, using Lemma 3.3 and  $\tau > 4$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{a\tilde{W}_n^*t^2 > 1\}}(1 + a\tilde{W}_n^*t^2/2)] \leq \frac{3}{2}at^2\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{a\tilde{W}_n^*t^2 > 1\}}\tilde{W}_n^*] = o(t^2), \quad (4.12)$$

we finally obtain that, uniformly for  $t \in [-\eta, \eta]$ , there exists a  $b > 0$  such that  $|\phi_n(t)| \leq 1 - bt^2$ . Thus, there exists a constant  $a_2 > 0$  such that

$$\int_{[-\pi, \pi]} |\phi_n(t)|^l \frac{dt}{2\pi} \leq (1 - \varepsilon)^l + \int_{[-\eta, \eta]} (1 - bt^2)^l \frac{dt}{2\pi} \leq \frac{a_2}{l^{1/2}}, \quad (4.13)$$

which proves (4.3) for  $\delta = 2$  and  $\tau > 4$ .

In order to prove (4.3) for  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ , for which  $\delta = \tau - 2 < 2$ , we have to obtain a sharper upper bound on  $|\phi_n(t)|$ . For this, we identify  $\phi_n(t) = \text{Re}(\phi_n(t)) + i\text{Im}(\phi_n(t))$ , where

$$\text{Re}(\phi_n(t)) = \mathbb{E}[\cos(\tilde{W}_n^* \sin(t))e^{-\tilde{W}_n^*[1-\cos(t)]}], \quad \text{Im}(\phi_n(t)) = \mathbb{E}[\sin(\tilde{W}_n^* \sin(t))e^{-\tilde{W}_n^*[1-\cos(t)]}], \quad (4.14)$$

so that

$$|\phi_n(t)|^2 = \text{Re}(\phi_n(t))^2 + \text{Im}(\phi_n(t))^2. \quad (4.15)$$

We start by upper bounding  $|\text{Im}(\phi_n(t))|$ , by using that  $|\sin(t)| \leq |t|$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , so that

$$|\text{Im}(\phi_n(t))| \leq |t|\mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_n^*] = |t|(1 + o(1)). \quad (4.16)$$

Further,

$$\text{Re}(\phi_n(t)) = 1 - \mathbb{E}[1 - \cos(\tilde{W}_n^* \sin(t))] + \mathbb{E}[\cos(\tilde{W}_n^* \sin(t))[e^{-\tilde{W}_n^*[1-\cos(t)]} - 1]]. \quad (4.17)$$

By the uniform convergence in (4.6) and the fact that, for  $\eta > 0$  small enough,  $\operatorname{Re}(\phi(t)) \geq 0$ , we only need to derive an upper bound on  $\operatorname{Re}(\phi_n(t))$  rather than on  $|\operatorname{Re}(\phi_n(t))|$ . For this, we use the fact that  $1 - e^{-x} \leq x$  and  $1 - \cos(t) \leq t^2/2$ , to bound

$$|\mathbb{E}[\cos(\tilde{W}_n^* \sin(t))][e^{-\tilde{W}_n^*[1-\cos(t)]} - 1]]| \leq \mathbb{E}[1 - e^{-\tilde{W}_n^*[1-\cos(t)]}] \leq [1 - \cos(t)]\mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_n^*] \leq \tilde{\nu}_n t^2/2. \quad (4.18)$$

Further, using (4.10) whenever  $\tilde{W}_n^*|t| \leq 1$ , so that also  $\tilde{W}_n^*|\sin(t)| \leq \tilde{W}_n^*|t| \leq 1$ , and  $1 - \cos(\tilde{W}_n^* \sin(t)) \geq 0$  otherwise, we obtain

$$\operatorname{Re}(\phi_n(t)) \leq 1 - a \sin(t)^2 \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{W}_n^*)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{W}_n^*|t| \leq 1\}}] + \tilde{\nu}_n t^2/2 = 1 - at^2 \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_n^3 \mathbb{1}_{\{W_n|t| \leq 1\}}]}{\mathbb{E}[W_n]} + \tilde{\nu}_n t^2/2. \quad (4.19)$$

By Lemma 3.3, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n^3 \mathbb{1}_{\{W_n|t| \leq 1\}}] \geq C_1(|t| \vee n^{-1/(\tau-1)})^{\tau-4}. \quad (4.20)$$

Combining (4.18) with (4.20), we obtain that, uniformly in  $|t| \leq \eta$  for some small enough  $\eta > 0$ ,

$$\operatorname{Re}(\phi_n(t)) \leq \begin{cases} 1 - 2a_{\text{ub}}|t|^{\tau-2} & \text{for } |t| \geq n^{-1/(\tau-1)}, \\ 1 - 2a_{\text{ub}}t^2 n^{(4-\tau)/(\tau-1)} & \text{for } |t| \leq n^{-1/(\tau-1)}, \end{cases} \quad (4.21)$$

which, combined with (4.15) and (4.16), shows that, for  $|t| \leq \eta$  and  $\eta > 0$  sufficiently small,

$$|\phi_n(t)| \leq \begin{cases} e^{-a_{\text{ub}}t^{2-\tau}} & \text{for } |t| \geq n^{-1/(\tau-1)}, \\ e^{-a_{\text{ub}}t^2 n^{(4-\tau)/(\tau-1)}} & \text{for } |t| \leq n^{-1/(\tau-1)}. \end{cases} \quad (4.22)$$

Thus, there exists a constant  $\tilde{a}_1 > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[-\pi, \pi]} |\phi_n(t)|^l \frac{dt}{2\pi} &\leq (1 - \varepsilon)^l + \int_{[-\eta, \eta]} e^{-la_{\text{ub}}|t|^{2-\tau}/2} dt + \int_{[-n^{-1/(\tau-1)}, n^{-1/(\tau-1)}]} e^{-la_{\text{ub}}t^2 n^{(4-\tau)/(\tau-1)}/2} dt \\ &\leq \frac{\tilde{a}_1}{l^{1/(\tau-2)}} + \frac{\tilde{a}_1 n^{(\tau-4)/2(\tau-1)}}{\sqrt{l}} = \tilde{a}_1 (l^{-1/\delta} + n^{(\tau-4)/2(\tau-1)} l^{-1/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

which proves (4.3) for  $\tau \in (3, 4)$  and with  $\delta = \tau - 2$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.4(a).* By (4.2) and Lemma 3.6,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k) &\leq c(\varepsilon_n^{1/(\delta-1)} \vee n^{-1/(\tau-1)}) + \tilde{a}_1 \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l^{(\delta+1)/\delta}} + \tilde{a}_1 \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} l^{-3/2} \\ &\leq c(\varepsilon_n \vee n^{(\delta-1)/(\tau-1)})^{1/(\delta-1)} + \frac{\tilde{a}_1 \delta}{k^{1/\delta}} + (n^{(\tau-4)/2(\tau-1)} \wedge 1) k^{-1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

The proof is completed by noting that, for  $k \geq n^{\delta/(\delta+1)} = n^{(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)}$ ,

$$n^{(\tau-4)/2(\tau-1)} k^{-1/2} \leq n^{(\tau-4)/2(\tau-1)} n^{(\tau-2)/2(\tau-1)} = n^{-1/(\tau-1)}. \quad (4.25)$$

Thus, the last term in (4.24) can be incorporated into the first term, for the appropriate choice of  $a_1$ . This proves the claim in (2.23).  $\square$

**An upper bound on the expected cluster size: Proof of Proposition 2.5.** We now slightly extend the above computation to prove a bound on the expected cluster size. We pick  $\Lambda > 0$  so large that  $\tilde{\nu}_n = (1 + \tilde{\varepsilon}_n)\nu_n \leq 1 - n^{-(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)}$ , which is possible since  $\nu_n - 1 \leq cn^{-(\tau-3)/(\tau-1)} \leq cn^{-(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)}$  by Corollary 3.2(b) and (2.22). Then, by (3.26) and (4.1), as required

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{C}(V_n)|] \leq \mathbb{E}[T^{(2)}] \leq \mathbb{E}[T] = \frac{1}{1 - \tilde{\nu}_n} \leq n^{(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)}. \quad (4.26)$$

## 5 A lower bound on the cluster tail

In this section, we prove a lower bound on the cluster tail. The key ingredient in the proof of Proposition 2.4(b) is again the coupling to branching processes. Note the explicit coupling between the cluster size  $|\mathcal{C}(V_n)|$  and the total progeny  $T^{(2)}$  described there. We can then bound

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k) \geq \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, |\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k) = \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k) - \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, |\mathcal{C}(V_n)| < k). \quad (5.1)$$

The following lemmas contain bounds on both contributions:

**Lemma 5.1** (Lower bound tail total progeny). *Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.4(b), there exists a constant  $a_2 > 0$  such that, for all  $k \leq \varepsilon n^{(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq k) \geq \frac{2a_2}{k^{1/\delta}}. \quad (5.2)$$

**Lemma 5.2** (Upper bound cluster tail coupling). *Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small. Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.4(b), there exists constants  $c, q > 0$  such that, for all  $k \leq \varepsilon n^{(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, |\mathcal{C}(V_n)| < k) \leq \frac{c\varepsilon^q}{k^{1/\delta}}. \quad (5.3)$$

*Proof of Proposition 2.4(b) subject to Lemmas 5.1-5.2.* Recall (5.1), and substitute the bounds in Lemmas 5.1-5.2 to conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| \geq k) \geq \frac{2a_2}{(2k)^{1/\delta}} - \frac{c\varepsilon^p}{k^{1/\delta}} \geq \frac{a_2}{k^{1/\delta}}, \quad (5.4)$$

when  $\varepsilon > 0$  is so small that  $2^{1-1/\delta}a_2 - c\varepsilon^p \geq a_2$ . This is possible, since  $\delta > 1$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 5.1.* We start by noting that

$$\mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq k) \geq \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq k, X_1 = 1) = \mathbb{P}(T \geq k-1)\mathbb{P}(X_1 = 1) \geq \mathbb{P}(T \geq k)\mathbb{P}(X_1 = 1). \quad (5.5)$$

Note that  $\mathbb{P}(X_1 = 1) = \mathbb{E}[W_n e^{-W_n}] = \mathbb{E}[W e^{-W}] + o(1)$ , which remains strictly positive. Thus, it suffices to prove a lower bound on  $\mathbb{P}(T \geq k)$ . For this, we bound

$$\mathbb{P}(T \geq k) \geq \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(T = l) = \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^l X_i = l-1\right) \geq \sum_{l=k}^{2k} \frac{1}{l} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^l X_i = l-1\right). \quad (5.6)$$

We prove the bounds for  $\tau \in (3, 4)$  and  $\tau > 4$  simultaneously, the latter being somewhat simpler. We shall follow a large part of the analysis for the upper bound in Proposition 4.1. Recall (4.4), to get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^l X_i = l-1\right) = \int_{[-\pi, \pi]} \operatorname{Re}\left(e^{it}\left(e^{-it}\phi_n(t)\right)^l\right) \frac{dt}{2\pi}. \quad (5.7)$$



It is not hard to see that, by the arguments in the proof of Proposition 4.1 (in particular, recall (4.22)),

$$\int_{[-\pi, \pi]} \left| (e^{it} - 1)(e^{-it}\phi_n(t))^l \right| \frac{dt}{2\pi} \leq cl^{-2/\delta}, \quad (5.8)$$

and, with  $K_l = Kl^{-1/\delta}$ ,

$$\int_{[-\pi, \pi] \setminus [-K_l, K_l]} (e^{-it}\phi_n(t))^l \frac{dt}{2\pi} \geq -e^{-cK^{\tau-2}} l^{-1/\delta}, \quad (5.9)$$

so we are left to prove a lower bound of the form  $cl^{-1/\delta}$  for  $\int_{[-K_l, K_l]} \operatorname{Re}((e^{-it}\phi_n(t))^l) \frac{dt}{2\pi}$ . Note that, by the uniform convergence of  $e^{-it}\phi_n(t)$  to  $e^{-it}\phi(t)$ , we have that  $e^{-it}\phi_n(t) \rightarrow 1$  uniformly for  $t \in [-K_l, K_l]$ .

Let  $\varphi_n(t) = e^{-it}\phi_n(t)$ ,  $\varphi(t) = e^{-it}\phi(t)$ . By scaling,

$$\int_{[-K_l, K_l]} \operatorname{Re}(\varphi_n(t)^l) \frac{dt}{2\pi} = l^{-1/\delta} \int_{[-K, K]} \operatorname{Re}(\varphi_n(tl^{-1/\delta})^l) \frac{dt}{2\pi}. \quad (5.10)$$

We rewrite

$$\varphi_n(t)^l = \varphi(t)^l \left( 1 + \frac{\varphi_n(t) - \varphi(t)}{\varphi(t)} \right)^l, \quad (5.11)$$

so that

$$\operatorname{Re}(\varphi_n(t)^l) = \operatorname{Re}(\varphi(t)^l) \operatorname{Re}\left(1 + \frac{\varphi_n(t) - \varphi(t)}{\varphi(t)}\right)^l - \operatorname{Im}(\varphi(t)^l) \operatorname{Im}\left(1 + \frac{\varphi_n(t) - \varphi(t)}{\varphi(t)}\right)^l. \quad (5.12)$$

When  $t \rightarrow 0$ , with  $\alpha = (\tau \wedge 4) - 2$ ,

$$\varphi(t) = e^{-c|t|^\alpha(1+o(1))}, \quad (5.13)$$

since  $W^* - 1$  is in the domain of attraction of an  $\alpha$ -stable distribution when (1.6) or (1.9) hold, and thus also  $X = \operatorname{Poi}(W^*) - 1$  is. Thus, pointwise in  $t$  as  $l \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\operatorname{Re}(\varphi(tl^{-1/(\tau-2)})^l) = e^{-c|t|^\alpha(1+o(1))}, \quad \operatorname{Im}(\varphi(tl^{-1/\delta})^l) = o(1). \quad (5.14)$$

Therefore, also using the fact that

$$\left| \operatorname{Im}(\varphi(tl^{-1/\delta})^l) \operatorname{Im}\left(1 + \frac{\varphi_n(tl^{-1/\delta}) - \varphi(tl^{-1/\delta})}{\varphi(tl^{-1/\delta})}\right)^l \right| \leq |\varphi_n(tl^{-1/\delta})^l| \leq e^{-c|t|^\alpha}, \quad (5.15)$$

which is integrable, dominated convergence gives that, for every  $K > 0$ ,

$$\int_{[-K, K]} \operatorname{Im}(\varphi(tl^{-1/\delta})^l) \operatorname{Im}\left(1 + \frac{\varphi_n(tl^{-1/\delta}) - \varphi(tl^{-1/\delta})}{\varphi(tl^{-1/\delta})}\right)^l \frac{dt}{2\pi} = o(1). \quad (5.16)$$

By Corollary 3.2(a) and the fact that  $|\varphi(t)| \geq 1/2$  for all  $|t| \leq K_l$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re}\left(1 + \frac{\varphi_n(t) - \varphi(t)}{\varphi(t)}\right)^l &\geq (1 - 2|\varphi_n(t) - \varphi(t)|)^l \geq 1 - 2l|\varphi_n(t) - \varphi(t)| \\ &\geq 1 - 2lcn^{-(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)} + 2cl|t|(|\varepsilon_n| + n^{-(\tau-3)/(\tau-1)}) \\ &\geq 1 - 2c(ln^{-(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)} - 2c|t|l^{1/(\tau-2)}(ln^{-(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)})^{(\tau-3)/(\tau-2)}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

Now we use the fact that  $l \leq 2k \leq 2\varepsilon n^{\delta/(\delta+1)}$ , where  $\delta/(\delta+1) = (\tau-2)/(\tau-1)$  for  $\tau \in (3, 4)$  and  $\delta/(\delta+1) = 2/3 < (\tau-2)/(\tau-1)$  for  $\tau > 4$ , while  $|\varepsilon_n| \leq \Lambda n^{-(\delta-1)/(\delta+1)}$ , where  $(\delta-1)/(\delta+1) = (\tau-3)/(\tau-1)$  for  $\tau \in (3, 4)$  and  $(\delta-1)/(\delta+1) = 1/3 < (\tau-3)/(\tau-1)$  for  $\tau > 4$ . Therefore, for  $\tau > 4$ , the left-hand side of (5.17) is  $1 + o(1)$ , while, for  $\tau \in (3, 4)$  we can bound it as

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re}\left(1 + \frac{\varphi_n(t) - \varphi(t)}{\varphi(t)}\right)^l &\geq 1 - 4c\varepsilon - 4c\varepsilon^{(\tau-3)/(\tau-2)}(1 + \Lambda)|t|^{1/(\tau-2)} \\ &\geq 1 - 4c\varepsilon - 4c\varepsilon^{(\tau-3)/(\tau-2)}(1 + \Lambda)K \geq 1/2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

when  $4c\varepsilon(1 + \Lambda) + 4c\varepsilon^{(\tau-3)/(\tau-2)}K \leq 1/2$ . In particular, for all  $|t| \leq K_l$ , the left-hand side of (5.18) is non-negative. Therefore, we arrive at the claim that, for  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small, there exists  $C = C(\varepsilon, \Lambda) > 0$  such that, as  $l \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\int_{[-K, K]} \operatorname{Re}(\varphi_n(tl^{-1/\delta})^l) \frac{dt}{2\pi} \geq C \int_{[-K, K]} e^{-c|t|^\alpha} dt + o(1). \quad (5.19)$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 5.1.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 5.2.* In the proof, we will make repeated use of the following lemma:

**Lemma 5.3** (Upper bound on tail probabilities of random sums). *Suppose that  $(T_l)_{l \geq 1}$  are i.i.d. random variables for which there exist constants  $K > 0$  and  $\delta > 1$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(T_l \geq k) \leq Kk^{-1/\delta}, \quad (5.20)$$

*and let  $M$  be independent from  $(T_l)_{l \geq 1}$ . Then, there exists a constant  $c_\delta > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{l=1}^M T_l \geq k\right) \leq c_\delta K \mathbb{E}[M] k^{-1/\delta}. \quad (5.21)$$

*Proof.* We split, depending on whether there exists a  $j \in [M]$  such that  $T_j \geq k$  or not,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{l=1}^M T_l \geq k\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\exists j \in [M] : T_j \geq k) + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{l=1}^M T_l \mathbb{1}_{\{T_l \leq k\}} \geq k\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[M] \mathbb{P}(T_1 \geq k) + \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=1}^M T_l \mathbb{1}_{\{T_l \leq k\}}\right] \\ &\leq K \mathbb{E}[M] k^{-1/\delta} + \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E}[M] \sum_{l=1}^k \mathbb{P}(T_1 \geq l) \\ &\leq K \mathbb{E}[M] \left(k^{-1/\delta} + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^k l^{-1/\delta}\right) \leq c_\delta K \mathbb{E}[M] k^{-1/\delta}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

where in the second inequality, we use Boole's inequality for the first term and Markov's inequality for the second.  $\square$

We write

$$\mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, |\mathcal{C}(V_n)| < k) = \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, |\mathcal{C}(V_n)| = t). \quad (5.23)$$

For  $j \in [n]$ , let  $M_j(t)$  denote the number of times the mark  $j$  is drawn in the first  $t$  draws, and define  $N_t = \{j \in [n] : M_j(t) \geq 2\}$ . For  $j \in [n]$ , let  $(T_{j,s})_{s=1}^\infty$  be an i.i.d. sequence of random variables where  $T_{j,1}$  is the total progeny of a branching process which has a  $\text{Poi}(w_j)$  offspring in the first generation, and offspring distribution  $\text{Poi}(W_n^*)$  in all later generations. When  $|\mathcal{C}(V_n)| = t$ , but  $T^{(2)} \geq 2k > t$ , then we must have that the total progeny of the thinned vertices is at least  $k$ . A vertex is thinned precisely when its mark is chosen at least twice, so that we can bound

$$\mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, |\mathcal{C}(V_n)| = t) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, |\mathcal{C}(V_n)| = t, \sum_{j \in N_t} \tilde{T}_{j,t} \geq k\right), \quad (5.24)$$

where, since all repetitions of vertex  $j$  after the first are thinned,

$$\tilde{T}_{j,t} = \sum_{s=1}^{M_j(t)-1} T_{j,s}. \quad (5.25)$$

Since  $t \mapsto N_t$  and  $t \mapsto M_j(t)$  are non-decreasing, we arrive at

$$\mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, |\mathcal{C}(V_n)| < k) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, \sum_{j \in N_k} \tilde{T}_{j,k} \geq k\right). \quad (5.26)$$

Now, as in the proof of Lemma 5.3, we split the event  $\sum_{j \in N_k} \tilde{T}_{j,k} \geq k$  into the event where all  $\tilde{T}_{j,k} \leq k$  and the event where there exists a  $j \in N_k$  such that  $\tilde{T}_{j,k} \geq k$ , to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, |\mathcal{C}(V_n)| < k) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, j \in N_k, \tilde{T}_{j,k} \geq k) + \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, \sum_{j \in N_k} \tilde{T}_{j,k} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{T}_{j,k} \leq k\}} \geq k) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n \left[ \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, j \in N_k, \tilde{T}_{j,k} \geq k) + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^k \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, j \in N_k, \tilde{T}_{j,k} \geq l) \right], \end{aligned}$$

the last bound by the Markov inequality.

Let  $(K_1, K_2)$  be the first two times before  $\tilde{T}$  for which  $M_{K_1} = M_{K_2} = j$ . Then, noting that  $T^{(2)} \geq k_1$  needs to occur when  $K_1 = k_1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, j \in N_k, \tilde{T}_{j,k} \geq l) &\leq \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < k_2 \leq k} \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq k_1, (K_1, K_2) = (k_1, k_2)) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{T}_{j,k} \geq l \mid (K_1, K_2) = (k_1, k_2)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

We wish to apply Lemma 5.3 to  $\tilde{T}_{j,k}$  in (5.25), where  $M$  is  $M_j(k) - 1$  conditioned on  $(K_1, K_2) = (k_1, k_2)$ . When  $k \leq \varepsilon n^{(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[M_j(k) - 1 \mid (K_1, K_2) = (k_1, k_2)] = 2 + (k - k_2) \frac{w_j}{\ell_n} \leq 2 + \varepsilon n^{(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)} \frac{w_1}{\ell_n} = O(1). \quad (5.28)$$

In order to apply Lemma 5.3, we proceed by checking (5.20). Note that  $(T_{j,s})_{s \geq 1}$  is i.i.d. with  $T_{j,1} = 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{P_j} T_l$ , where  $P_j \sim \text{Poi}(w_j)$  and where  $(T_l)_{l \geq 1}$  is an i.i.d. sequence of total progenies of branching processes with offspring distribution  $\text{Poi}(W_n^*)$ . Thus, by Lemma 5.3, for which the assumption follows from Proposition 2.4(a) (using the fact that  $\varepsilon_n \leq 0$ ), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{j,1} \geq l) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{P_j} T_j \geq l - 1\right) \leq c_\delta a_1 \mathbb{E}[P_j] l^{-1/\delta} = \frac{c_\delta a_1 w_j}{l^{1/\delta}}. \quad (5.29)$$

Therefore, applying Lemma 5.3 yields that

$$\mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, j \in N_k, \tilde{T}_{j,k} \geq l) \leq \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < k_2 \leq k} \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq k_1, (K_1, K_2) = (k_1, k_2)) \frac{c_\delta a_1 w_j}{l^{1/\delta}}. \quad (5.30)$$

The factor  $w_j$  appearing in (5.30) can be harmful when  $w_j$  is large. To resolve this problem, for  $j$  such that  $w_j \geq k^{1/\delta}$ , we simply bound the restrictions on  $\tilde{T}_{j,k}$  away, so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, |\mathcal{C}(V_n)| < k) \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < k_2 \leq k} \mathbb{1}_{\{w_j < k^{1/\delta}\}} \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq k_1, (K_1, K_2) = (k_1, k_2)) \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < k_2 \leq k} \mathbb{1}_{\{w_j \geq k^{1/\delta}\}} c_\delta a_1 w_j \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq k_1, (K_1, K_2) = (k_1, k_2)) \left( \frac{1}{l^{1/\delta}} + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{1}{l^{1/\delta}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.31)$$

Performing the sum over  $l$  and bounding  $\mathbb{P}((K_1, K_2) = (k_1, k_2)) \leq (w_j/\ell_n)^2$  leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, |\mathcal{C}(V_n)| < k) & \leq c c_\delta a_1 \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < k_2 \leq k} \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq k_1) \left( \frac{w_j}{k^{1/\delta}} \wedge 1 \right) \left( \frac{w_j}{\ell_n} \right)^2 \\ & \leq c c_\delta a_1 \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < k_2 \leq k} \left( \frac{w_j}{\ell_n} \right)^2 a_2 k_1^{-1/\delta} \left( \frac{w_j}{k^{1/\delta}} \wedge 1 \right) \\ & \leq c c_\delta a_1 \frac{n k^{2-1/\delta}}{\ell_n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ W_n \left( \frac{W_n^2}{k^{1/\delta}} \wedge 1 \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

When  $\tau > 4$ , we have that  $\delta = 2$  and  $k \leq \varepsilon n^{2/3}$ , so that we can bound the above by

$$\mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, |\mathcal{C}(V_n)| < k) \leq C_\delta \frac{k^{2-2/\delta}}{n} \mathbb{E}[(W^*)^2] = C_\delta \frac{k}{n} = C_\delta \frac{k^{3/2}}{n} k^{-1/2} \leq C_\delta \varepsilon^{3/2} k^{-1/2}, \quad (5.33)$$

for some constant  $C_\delta > 0$ , so that (5.3) follows with  $q = 3/2$ .

When  $\tau \in (3, 4)$ , we use Lemma 3.3, now with  $k \leq \varepsilon n^{(\tau-2)/(\tau-1)}$  and  $\delta = \tau - 2$ , to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(T^{(2)} \geq 2k, |\mathcal{C}(V_n)| < k) & \leq C_\delta \frac{k^{2-2/\delta}}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[ W_n^3 \mathbb{1}_{\{W_n \leq k^{1/\delta}\}} \right] + C_\delta \frac{k^{2-1/\delta}}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[ W_n^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{W_n > k^{1/\delta}\}} \right] \\ & \leq C_\delta \left( \frac{k^{(\tau-1)/(\tau-2)}}{n} \right) k^{-1/(\tau-2)} \leq C_\delta \varepsilon^{(\tau-1)/(\tau-2)} k^{-1/(\tau-2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.34)$$

for some constant  $C_\delta > 0$ , so that (5.3) follows with  $q = (\tau - 1)/(\tau - 2) > 1$ .  $\square$

**Acknowledgements.** This work was supported in part by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). The author gratefully acknowledges the hospitality of the Mittag-Leffler Institute (MLI), where part of this work was carried out, and the lively discussions there with Svante Janson, Tomasz Łuczak, Michał Karoński and Tatyana Turova, as well as Johan van Leeuwen and two anonymous referees for useful comments on a preliminary version that greatly improved the presentation.

# References

- [1] D. Aldous. Brownian excursions, critical random graphs and the multiplicative coalescent. *Ann. Probab.*, **25**(2):812–854, (1997).
- [2] J. van den Berg and H. Kesten. Inequalities with applications to percolation and reliability. *J. Appl. Prob.*, **22**:556–569, (1985).
- [3] S. Bhamidi, R. van der Hofstad, and J. van Leeuwaarden. Novel scaling limits for critical inhomogeneous random graphs. Preprint (2009).
- [4] S. Bhamidi, R. van der Hofstad, and J. van Leeuwaarden. Scaling limits for critical inhomogeneous random graphs with finite third moments. Preprint (2009).
- [5] B. Bollobás. The evolution of random graphs. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **286**(1):257–274, (1984).
- [6] B. Bollobás. *Random graphs*, volume **73** of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, (2001).
- [7] B. Bollobás, S. Janson, and O. Riordan. The phase transition in inhomogeneous random graphs. *Random Structures Algorithms*, **31**(1):3–122, (2007).
- [8] C. Borgs, J. Chayes, R. van der Hofstad, G. Slade, and J. Spencer. Random subgraphs of finite graphs. I. The scaling window under the triangle condition. *Random Structures Algorithms*, **27**(2):137–184, (2005).
- [9] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, H. Kesten, and J. Spencer. Uniform boundedness of critical crossing probabilities implies hyperscaling. *Random Structures Algorithms*, **15**(3-4):368–413, (1999).
- [10] T. Britton, M. Deijfen, and A. Martin-Löf. Generating simple random graphs with prescribed degree distribution. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **124**(6):1377–1397, (2006).
- [11] F. Chung and L. Lu. Connected components in random graphs with given expected degree sequences. *Ann. Comb.*, **6**(2):125–145, (2002).
- [12] F. Chung and L. Lu. The average distance in a random graph with given expected degrees. *Internet Math.*, **1**(1):91–113, (2003).
- [13] F. Chung and L. Lu. *Complex graphs and networks*, volume **107** of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, (2006).
- [14] F. Chung and L. Lu. The volume of the giant component of a random graph with given expected degrees. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, **20**:395–411, (2006).
- [15] M. Dwass. The total progeny in a branching process and a related random walk. *J. Appl. Prob.*, **6**:682–686, (1969).
- [16] P. Erdős and A. Rényi. On the evolution of random graphs. *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl.*, **5**:17–61, (1960).

- [17] G. Grimmett. *Percolation*. Springer, Berlin, 2nd edition, (1999).
- [18] H. Hatami and M. Molloy. The scaling window for a random graph with a given degree sequence. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:0907.4211*, (2009).
- [19] M. Heydenreich and R. van der Hofstad. Random graph asymptotics on high-dimensional tori. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **270**(2):335–358, (2007).
- [20] R. van der Hofstad and M. Keane. An elementary proof of the hitting time theorem. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, **115**(8):753–756, (2008).
- [21] R. van der Hofstad and M. Łuczak. Random subgraphs of the 2D Hamming graph: The supercritical phase. *Probab. Theory and Rel. Fields*, **47**:1–41, (2010).
- [22] S. Janson. The largest component in a subcritical random graph with a power law degree distribution. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, **18**(4):1651–1668, (2008).
- [23] S. Janson. The probability that a random multigraph is simple. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, **18**(1-2):205–225, (2009).
- [24] S. Janson. Asymptotic equivalence and contiguity of some random graphs. *Random Structures Algorithms*, **36**(1):26–45, (2010).
- [25] S. Janson, D.E. Knuth, T. Łuczak, and B. Pittel. The birth of the giant component. *Random Structures Algorithms*, **4**(3):231–358, (1993). With an introduction by the editors.
- [26] S. Janson and M. Łuczak. A new approach to the giant component problem. *Random Structures Algorithms*, **34**(2):197–216, (2009).
- [27] S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Ruciński. *Random graphs*. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization. Wiley-Interscience, New York, (2000).
- [28] M. Kang and T. G. Seierstad. The critical phase for random graphs with a given degree sequence. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, **17**(1):67–86, (2008).
- [29] T. Łuczak. Component behavior near the critical point of the random graph process. *Random Structures Algorithms*, **1**(3):287–310, (1990).
- [30] T. Łuczak, B. Pittel, and J. Wierman. The structure of a random graph at the point of the phase transition. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **341**(2):721–748, (1994).
- [31] M. Molloy and B. Reed. A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence. *Random Structures Algorithms*, **6**(2-3):161–179, (1995).
- [32] I. Norros and H. Reittu. On a conditionally Poissonian graph process. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, **38**(1):59–75, (2006).
- [33] R. Otter. The multiplicative process. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **20**:206–224, (1949).
- [34] B. Pittel. On the largest component of the random graph at a nearcritical stage. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **82**(2):237–269, (2001).
- [35] T.S. Turova. Diffusion approximation for the components in critical inhomogeneous random graphs of rank 1. Preprint (2009).